

In the matter of Amendment of Part 97 of the Commissions rules concerning permitted emissions and control requirements, RM-11306

To: The Commission

The ARRL Bandwidth Proposal does not fully resolve problems existing in the Amateur Radio Service. It does not fully reduce or eliminate the regulatory burden of changing rules as the requirements of the Amateur Service change.

The ARRL proposal would change band segmentation from that by mode, to that by bandwidth. This change will accomplish very little. I am proposing that band segmentation be eliminated entirely in the Amateur Radio Service.

The ARRL is also proposing that only automatically controlled stations should be restricted to specific areas of each band. They propose that semi-automatically stations not be subject to these restrictions. This will result in serious harmful interference to other stations by semiautomatically controlled stations.

Semi-automatic operation and automatic operation should both be subjected to this restriction.

## **Discussion**

The ARRL in a proposal assigned the number RM-11306 has proposed that band segmentation be designated by bandwidth instead of mode.

One of the major issues facing Amateur Radio today on the High frequency (H.F.) bands is that the band segments for voice operation are crowded during favorable band conditions. At the same time over half of the Amateur frequencies on these same bands are only lightly utilized because voice operation is not permitted on much of our allocated spectrum in the US. The result is very inefficient use of these frequencies.

The ARRL proposal does nothing to address this problem. The ARRL proposal does little to improve the flexibility of band segmentation, as requirements change.

While the current system of band segmentation by mode does not separate incompatible modes, the system proposed by the ARRL likewise does not offer this separation. Band segmentation serves no purpose and limits efficient use of our spectrum.

Managing the use of incompatible modes can be best accomplished by volunteer band plans established by the Amateur Community. In almost every other country in the world, the government regulations simply require operation within the allocated frequency range. This is the case in Canada. There is not any reason why this cannot be done in the United States.

Radio signals on the H.F. frequencies are international in nature and do not stop at borders. Therefore restrictions that affect only the US are of no value and needlessly restrict the US Amateur community. US Amateurs should not be prohibited from fully utilizing their allocated spectrum fully and efficiently.

Eliminating band segmentation by mode or bandwidth will relieve the Commission of the burden of periodically modifying the rules to accommodate changes in technology and needs. It is in the spirit of de regulation.

From ARRL Proposal RM-11306 2. (c) Page 3 Quoting the ARRL:

“The Commission’s rules alone cannot, and should not be expected effectively prevent conflicts in HF spectrum usage between amateurs pursuing different operating interests on-air. Responsibility for resolving conflicts in shared spectrum must be shouldered by the Amateur community itself. Voluntary band planning must be adequate and must gain broad acceptance by amateurs as the best means of protecting their individual interests. Traditionally, these cooperative methods have worked satisfactorily.”

If concern exists that these band plans will not be adhered to, a rule concept taken from repeater coordination, (97.205 c) that has proven to be successful in repeater coordination can be adapted to this situation.

I have modified this rule to apply to band plans as follows in this example:

*“Where the transmissions of an Amateur Radio station cause harmful interference to another Amateur Radio station, the two station licensees are equally and fully responsible for resolving the interference unless the operation of one station is in adherence with a recognized band plan and the operation of the other station is not. In that case, the licensee of the station that is not in adherence with a recognized band plan has primary responsibility to resolve the interference.”*

### **Automatic and Semiautomatic control.**

Both automatic and semi-automatically controlled stations are stations that operate without a control operator present. The frequency is not monitored in a manner to effectively prevent these stations that operate without a control operator from causing harmful interference to other Amateur Radio Stations.

I disagree with the ARRL that semi-automatically controlled stations do not present a significant risk of interference to other operations. These stations do not have a control operator present to monitor the frequency. I maintain that listen before transmit protocols will not be sufficient to prevent harmful interference from disrupting communications in progress. On the H.F. bands it is common place that all stations in a conversation can not be heard from a particular location due to propagation.

The semi-automatic station will see the frequency as a clear frequency. It will then transmit blocking reception by other stations that are listening to one of the stations in their group that the semi-automatic station cannot hear.

All stations that do not have a control operator monitoring the frequency for use when they initiate operation should be restricted to a specific area. This includes both automatic and semiautomatically controlled stations.

These recommendations will result in improved spectrum use efficiency in the Amateur Radio Service and reduce the regulatory burden for the FCC.

Respectfully submitted;

/s/ Thomas H Norris

Thomas H Norris NU4G